

REMARKS

In the above referenced case, claims 125-128 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 127 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 125-128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly including new matter. Applicant has deleted one of the two limitations (in each of independent claims 125 and 127) objected to by the Examiner (i.e., without previously subcombining any plurality of the altered separate primary color beams) and respectfully submits that claims 125-128 have overcome the 112 rejections.

The Examiner was not persuaded by Applicant's arguments with respect to these rejections in the response filed on November 14, 2005. Applicant hereby expressly retracts those arguments in their entirety.<sup>1</sup>

III. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections over KUREMATSU in View of KONNO

Claims 125-128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurematsu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,153,752 ("KUREMATSU") in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 ("KONNO").

The Examiner relied on KONNO for rejecting certain limitations in element [a] of independent claims 125 and 127 and relied on Figure 2 of KUREMATSU for all other elements.

Element [b][iv] of independent claim 125 recites at least "altering the selected predetermined orientation of the chosen component of the electric field vectors of a

---

<sup>1</sup> Such retracted arguments should, therefore, not form the basis for any claim construction or prosecution history estoppel.

plurality of portions of each of the separate primary color beams of light by passing each of the separate primary color beam or beams of light through a respective one of a plurality of altering means in a single direction ....”

KUREMATSU discloses a projector that implements the reflective type LCDs so that light passes through the LCDs twice in two opposite directions.<sup>2</sup> The projector configuration disclosed in KUREMATSU would not work with non-reflective type LCDs (e.g., transmissive type, etc.).

Element [b][iv] of independent claim 127 recites the same limitation as discussed above regarding independent claim 125.

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims (i.e., claims 125-128) are not unpatentable over KUREMATSU in view of KONNO and are in condition for allowance.

#### IV. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections over BAUR in View of KONNO

Claims 125-128 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baur et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,115,305 (“BAUR”) in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 (“KONNO”). See Official Action mailed on March 23, 2005.

The Examiner relied on KONNO for rejecting certain limitations in element [a] of independent claims 125 and 127 and relied on BAUR for all other elements.

Element [b][v] of claim 125 recites combining more than two altered separate color beams of light into a single collinear beam of light without substantially changing the altered selected predetermined orientation of the chosen component of the electric field vectors of the plurality of portions of any of the more than two altered separate beams of light.

In BAUR, a ½-wave retarder **45** rotates the plane of polarization of the image carrying red beam **88** before it is combined with the blue and green image carrying beams **84 & 86** in the polarizing beam recombiner cube **71**. Therefore, in BAUR, the polarization of one of the three beams to be

---

<sup>2</sup> “First to third liquid crystal panels 25R, 25G, and 25B of the reflection type ....” KUREMATSU, col. 5, lines 26-27.

combined has been substantially altered prior to being combined by the cube

71. BAUR, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 8.

In contrast, element [b][v] requires combining more than two altered beams ... without substantially changing the altered selected predetermined orientation of the chosen component of the electric field vectors of ... any of the more than two altered separate beams of light.

Element [b][v] of independent claim 127 recites the same limitation as discussed above regarding independent claim 125.

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims (i.e., claims 125-128) are not unpatentable over BAUR in view of KONNO and are in condition for allowance.

V. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections over ATARASHI in View of KONNO

Claims 125-128 were also previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atarashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,172,254 (“ATARASHI”) in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 (“KONNO”). See Official Actions mailed on June 15, 2004 and November 26, 2004.

The Examiner relied on KONNO for rejecting certain limitations in element [a] of independent claims 125 and 127 and relied on ATARASHI for all other elements.

Element [b] of independent claim 125 recites at least:

“[i] converting the randomly changing orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors of said primary beam into substantially the same predetermined orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors;

[ii] separating the primary beam of light having the same predetermined orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors into two or more primary color beams of light, each of the primary color beams having the same selected predetermined orientation of a chosen component of electric field vectors as that of the other primary color beams;....”

ATARASHI discloses a projector that includes a beam splitter 13 which separates the source beam into two beams having different polarizations (i.e., P and S).<sup>3</sup> Each separated source beam having either the P or S polarization is then further separated by color. The projector disclosed in ATARASHI does not convert the source beam into the same polarization before separating it by color.

Elements [b][i] and [b][ii] of independent claim 127 recites the same limitation as discussed above regarding independent claim 125.

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims (i.e., claims 125-128) are not unpatentable over ATARASHI in view of KONNO and are in condition for allowance.

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Roxana H. Yang  
Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP  
P.O. Box 400  
Los Altos, CA 94023  
(650) 948-0822

---

<sup>3</sup> “[I]n FIG. 5, random polarized light emitted from a light source 11 is condensed by a paraboloidal condenser mirror 12, is irradiated toward a polarized light beam splitter 13, and is separated into P and S polarized light components by the beam splitter 13.” ATARASHI, col. 7, lines 22-26.